

REMARKS

In this first office action after the present RCE, the examiner addressed applicant's arguments in paragraph 2 of the office action. Specifically, he indicated that the examiner disagreed with applicant's submission for two reasons. The first was that the claim was so broad that there was no claim limitation that teaches where exactly in the network the monitoring is taking place.

It is believed that it is not significant to the present invention where the monitoring physically takes place. The significant aspect is that the monitoring takes place after it receives the broadcast. The physical location is not significant. The significance is that there is a single monitoring station which receives the broadcast and documents the information based upon receipt of the broadcast.

As was previously pointed out in the Declaration submitted by Professor Memon, regardless of whether anyone else is tuned in and whether there is even a single user receiving the broadcast, or whether a particular user has requested and downloaded the broadcast, the fact that it has been broadcast is sufficient for the present invention. The present invention receives

that broadcast after it has been broadcast publicly regardless of whether any other user has

PAGE 8/8 * RCVD AT 7/17/2007 10:54:37 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-5/6 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:2129407190 * DURATION (mm-ss):08-14

Best Available Copy